

## REMARKS

Applicant has amended the Abstract, rendering moot the objection thereto.

Applicant respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 2-4, 6, and 8. In the as-filed claims, the terms “pedaling reaction force” and “pedaling operation” were used together in claim 2 because a pedaling operation (displacement of a pedal) causes a reaction force generating unit to apply a pedaling reaction force. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood this claim language, particularly in view of the teachings of the specification, *e.g.*, at pages 15-16, paragraph [0016]. Nevertheless, in order to move the case forward, Applicant has amended claim 2 to remove the cited indefinite language.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claims 1 and 8 over Takayama. In the present invention, as set forth, *e.g.*, in claim 1, a reaction force generating unit includes a damper device for applying a pedaling reaction force to an operating pedal on the basis of circulation resistance of a fluid by being mechanically compressed in accordance with a pedaling operation of the pedal, and a spring member for applying the pedaling reaction force to the operating pedal on the basis of resilient deformation. The pedaling reaction force of the damper device differs according to pedaling speed. Takayama discloses a damper 10, but Takayama does not disclose that a pedaling reaction force of the damper differs according to pedaling speed. Takayama also does not disclose a spring. At least for these reasons, Takayama does not anticipate that feature of the claimed invention under 35 § 102(a).

Applicant also traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claims 1-2 over Tulaczko. Tulaczko discloses a damper 2 or 4, but like Takayama, Tulaczko also fails to

disclose that the damper differs the pedaling reaction force according to pedaling speed, and at least for these reasons, fails to anticipate claims 1-2.

Applicant also respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-4, 6, and 8 over Fabrice. Contrary to the Examiner's position regarding the disclosure of Fabrice, Applicant asserts that element 20 in Fabrice is a cylindrical spring seat, and that element 16 is a guide stud. Neither component applies a pedaling reaction force to an operating pedal on the basis of circulation resistance of a fluid, or differentiates pedaling reaction force according to pedaling speed. For at least these reasons, Fabrice does not anticipate claims 1-4, 6 or 8.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant requests favorable reconsideration of the claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.



By: \* 27,680   
James W. Edmondson  
Reg. No. 33,871

Dated: August 7, 2006

**Attachments:**      Abstract